

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action dated August 13, 2003, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14, which remain in the application, were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Levy (U.S. Patent 5,944,790).

Claim 1 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising: allowing a user to select a language in which at least a portion of an electronic file is to be displayed; receiving the electronic file at the user's computer, wherein the electronic file's content includes a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages; at the user's computer, selecting, for display to the user, from the first plurality of phrases, a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user; and displaying to the user the second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user.

In contrast to the invention as recited in claim 1, Levy discloses preparation of multiple versions of web pages that are to be made available to a web site user. The content of each version of the web pages is expressed in a single language, such as English, Spanish, German, and the like. Based on various criteria, the system of Levy selects a page, expressed in a particular language, and provides that page to the user's computer for display to the user.

Levy does not disclose receiving an electronic file at the user's computer, wherein the electronic file's content includes a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages. Levy teaches transmission of separate HTML pages for separate languages, as opposed to a single electronic file containing a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages.

Levy discloses hyperlinks to Web documents in different languages. The text of each hyperlink is expressed in a single language, not a plurality of languages. For instance, in Figure 4 of Levy, one hyperlink is labeled "British English," another hyperlink is labeled "Espanol," another link is labeled "Francais," another hyperlink is labeled "Duetsch," and a final hyperlink

of this type is labeled "Japanese." Regardless of whether different links are expressed in different languages, the text of each link is stated in a single language.

Unlike Levy's disclosure, the invention of claim 1 is directed to an electronic file's content including a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages. For instance, referring to page 12, lines 26-29, of this application (i.e., application serial no. 09/309,372), an example of a phrase that is expressed in a plurality of languages is provided as follows:

l1[1]='Client Side Example'

l2[1]='Example Lateral De Client'

l3[1]='Ejemplo Lateral Del Cliente'

l4[1]='Klient Seitleiches Beispiel'

Levy, therefore, also does not teach or suggest selecting, for display to the user, from the first plurality of phrases, a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user.

The invention as recited in claim 1 provides significant advantages over the prior art of record by allowing a user to select a language in which at least a portion of an electronic file should be displayed to the user, without requiring any additional downloads of any additional electronic files. In this way, separate electronic files that are stored at separate locations (such as separate URL's for separate Web pages expressed in separate languages) are not needed thereby reducing the amount of data that needs to be stored and the amount of network traffic needed for displaying the electronic document in a language selected by the user.

Accordingly, Levy fails to establish prima facie anticipation or obviousness of the invention of claim 1 because Levy fails to teach or suggest: (1) receiving an electronic file at the user's computer, wherein the electronic file's content includes a plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages; and (2) at the user's computer, selecting, for display to the user, from the first plurality of phrases, a plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 6 recites a method of providing an electronic file to a user comprising the steps of: assigning to at least one word in the electronic file a plurality of identifiers, wherein each

identifier corresponds to one of a plurality of respective translations in the electronic file for said at least one word; allowing the user to select a language in which at least a portion of the electronic file is to be displayed; using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers, wherein the identifier corresponds to the language selected by the user, to obtain, from the respective translations in the electronic file, a translation, in the language selected by the user, for said at least one word; inserting the translation obtained from the electronic file into a translated electronic file; and displaying the translated electronic file to the user.

In contrast to the invention as recited in claim 6, Levy discloses preparation of multiple versions of web pages that are to be made available to a web site user. The content of each version of the web pages is expressed in a single language, such as English, Spanish, German, and the like. Based on various criteria, the system of Levy selects a page, expressed in a particular language, and provides that page to the user's computer for display to the user.

Levy, therefore, does not teach or suggest assigning to at least one word in the electronic file a plurality of identifiers, wherein each identifier corresponds to one of a plurality of respective translations in the electronic file for said at least one word. As mentioned above, Levy teaches transmission of separate HTML pages for separate languages. Accordingly, Levy also does not teach or suggest using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers, wherein the identifier corresponds to the language selected by the user, to obtain, from the respective translations in the electronic file, a translation, in the language selected by the user, for said at least one word. For at least these reasons, Levy fails to establish prima facie anticipation or obviousness of the invention of claim 6.

Claim 14 recites a method of displaying at least a portion of a document in a language selected by a user, said method comprising the steps of: assigning to a plurality of words in the document a plurality of identifiers, wherein each identifier corresponds to a respective one of a plurality of translations for said plurality of words; and at the receiving computer: (1) receiving the document from a sending computer, (2) allowing a user to select a language in which the document is to be displayed, (3) using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers to select a translation from the plurality of translations for said plurality of words, based upon the language selected by the client, (4) replacing the plurality of words in the document by inserting into the

document the selected plurality of respective translations for the plurality of words, and (5) displaying the document to the user.

In contrast to the invention as recited in claim 14, Levy discloses preparation of multiple versions of web pages that are to be made available to a web site user. The content of each version of the web pages is expressed in a single language, such as English, Spanish, German, and the like. Based on various criteria, the system of Levy selects a page, expressed in a particular language, and provides that page to the user's computer for display to the user.

Levy, therefore, does not teach or suggest assigning to a plurality of words in the document a plurality of identifiers, wherein each identifier corresponds to a respective one of a plurality of translations for said plurality of words. As mentioned above, Levy teaches transmission of separate HTML pages for separate languages. Accordingly, Levy also does not teach or suggest performing the following two steps at the receiving computer: (1) using an identifier from the plurality of identifiers to select a translation from the plurality of translations for said plurality of words, based upon the language selected by the client, and (2) replacing the plurality of words in the document by inserting into the document the selected plurality of respective translations for the plurality of words. For at least these reasons, Levy fails to establish prima facie anticipation or obviousness of the invention of claim 14.

Claims 2-5 and 7-13 properly depend upon claims 1 and 6, respectively. Therefore, these dependent claims are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 6.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.


Appln. No.: 09/309,372
Amendment dated November 12, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 13, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: November 12, 2003

By:


William J. Klein
Registration No. 43,719 (Reg. No. 32,688)

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
10 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001